

REMARKS

This is in response to the Official Action currently outstanding with respect to the above-identified application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 19 and 20 are pending. Claims 3, 6, 9 and 14-18 were previously withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention and species, the election having been made without traverse. By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 19 and 20 have been amended for purposes of clarifying the expression of inherent features already present therein. No Claims have been canceled and Claims 21-23 have been added. Accordingly, upon the entry to the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 19, and 20-23 will constitute the claims under active prosecution in this application.

The foregoing Amendment sets forth the claims of this application as they will stand in the event that the Examiner grants entry to this Amendment as required by the Rules.

In the currently outstanding Official Action, the Examiner has:

1. Acknowledged Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119(a)-(d) or (f), and confirmed the receipt by the United States Patent and Trademark Office of the required certified copy of the priority document;
2. Indicated that the drawings filed on 12 September 2003 have been accepted;

3. Failed to acknowledged Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement of 16 December 2003 by providing Applicants with a copy of the Form PTO-1449 that accompanied that submission duly signed, dated and initialed by the Examiner in confirmation of his consideration of the art listed therein; Acknowledgement of that Information Disclosure Statement in response to this communication is respectfully requested;

4. Rejected Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 19 and 20 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the Takeda, et al reference (US Patent No. 5,398,043).

5. Rejected Claims 2, 5, 8, and 11-13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Takeda, et al reference;

6. Rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 19 and 20 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicants' admitted prior art; and

7. Indicated that Applicants' arguments of 21 November 2003 have been considered but are not deemed to be persuasive on the grounds that he believes that the Takeda reference and/or Applicants' admitted prior art teaches supplementary capacitive drive circuitry that maintains a predetermined potential difference between supplementary capacitance lines and common signal lines.

Further comment regarding items 1-3 and 7 above is not deemed to be required in these Remarks.

It is a feature of the present invention that "a supplementary capacitance drive circuit drives the supplementary capacitance lines **based on a voltage applied to the counter electrode** so that a predetermined potential difference between the voltage applied to the counter electrode and a voltage applied to the pixel electrode **which voltages are different from one another** is always maintained. This feature of the claimed invention is clearly supported in the present specification at Page 26, lines 6-13, at Page 26, line 18, and at Page 27, line 5 (see also, Fig. 1). In other words, the point of the present invention is to maintain a predetermined potential difference between the Com signal and the Cs signal so that a defective part does not become a bright point when any of the pixel electrodes and supplementary capacitances leaks.

The operation of the Takeda reference was discussed in detail in response to the previous Official Action. That discussion will not be repeated herein, but is specifically incorporated by reference in support of the patentability of the present claims. Suffice it to say at this point that, referring to Takeda's Fig. 1, it will be understood that V_t is applied to a counter voltage and V_e is applied to a supplementary capacitance line. As it relates to the context of the present invention, it is understood that V_t of Takeda corresponds to the Com signal of the present invention, and that V_e of Takeda corresponds to the Cs signal of the present invention.

Therefore, simply stated, Takeda in Fig. 2(b) shows a waveform of a counter voltage as V_t , and in Fig. 2(c) shows a waveform of a modulation voltage V_e . Further, these figures indicate that while $V_e^{(-)}$ is applied, $V_e^{(-)}$ and V_t are different from each other and consequently a potential difference is maintained between $V_e^{(-)}$ and V_t . Similarly, while $V_e^{(+)}$ is applied, $V_e^{(+)}$ and V_t are different from each other and a potential difference is maintained between $V_e^{(+)}$ and V_t .

Accordingly, while it may be true that if the pixel capacitance or the supplemental capacitance in the Takeda et al reference structure leaks some level of potential difference between the pixel electrode and the counter electrode will be maintained, there is clearly and definitely nothing in the Takeda et al reference that teaches, discloses or suggests that a Ve is generated based upon Vt. In Takeda et al both $V_{e(+)}$ and $V_{e(-)}$ are individually adjustable with the emphasis being upon adjustments that will result in the overall DC potential being made to be zero, or as close to zero as possible. Accordingly, nothing in the Takeda, et al reference is sufficient to render the present invention either anticipated or obvious to one skilled in the art as of the time that it was made.

Accordingly, by the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended the claims of this application so as to clarify the fact that in the present invention the Cs signal is generated on the Com signal in the supplementary capacitance drive circuit to drive the supplementary capacitance lines. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that previously pending claims 1-2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-13 and 19-23 are allowable over the art currently of record, and that the Examiner's presently outstanding rejections should be withdrawn. A decision so holding in response to this communication is respectfully requested.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that to the extent that the so-called Applicants' admitted prior art is relevant to the determination of the allowability of the present claims, that relevance only exists (if at all) when V_{cs} is equal to V_{com} (i.e., when the supplemental capacitance lines are driven so that a predetermined potential difference between the voltage applied to the counter electrode and the voltage applied to the pixel electrode is always maintained ($V_{cs} - V_{com} = 0$) when any of the pixel electrodes and supplementary capacitances leaks.) By the present Amendment it has been clarified that in the present invention $V_{cs} \neq V_{com}$. Accordingly, Applicants' so-called admitted prior art clearly does not anticipate the claims as now presented, and a decision so holding is respectfully requested.

For each and all of the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that additional fees are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 8, 2004


SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Reg. No. 27,840

David A. Tucker
(type or print name of practitioner)
Attorney for Applicant

Tel. No. (617) 517-5508

Edwards & Angell, LLP
P. O. Box 55874
P.O. Address

Customer No. 21874

Boston, MA 02205